

The Honorable Barbara J. Rothstein

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

V.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity
as President of the United States of America,
et al.

Defendants.

NO. 2:19-01502-BJR

STIPULATED ORDER ESTABLISHING
BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR EXPEDITED
RESOLUTION OF THIS CASE AND
PROHIBITING DEFENDANTS'
OBLIGATION OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED
TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR NAVAL
BASE KITSAP PRIOR TO A DECISION BY
THIS COURT

STIPULATION

WHEREAS the State of Washington has filed this suit to enjoin Defendants' use of funds authorized to be appropriated by Congress for military construction projects, including \$88.96 million in funding for construction of the Bangor Pier and Maintenance facility at Naval Base Kitsap (*see* John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, Pub. L. No. 115-232, § 2201, 132 Stat. 1636 (2018));

1 WHEREAS the Department of Defense does not intend to obligate any portion of the
2 \$88.96 million authorized to be appropriated by Congress for the Bangor Pier and Maintenance
3 Facility prior to February 1, 2020;

4 WHEREAS the parties wish to avoid any motion practice aimed at ensuring that the
5 funds authorized to be appropriated for the Bangor Pier and Maintenance Facility remain
6 unobligated during the pendency of this litigation;

7 WHEREAS the parties agree this case can be resolved on an expedited basis prior to
8 February 1, 2020, through cross-motions for summary judgment and have agreed to a schedule
9 to enable the Court to issue a final judgment prior to that date;

10 WHEREAS in order to avoid litigation over a motion for a preliminary injunction and
11 other pretrial proceedings that would not further the interests of either party or judicial resources,
12 the parties respectfully request the Court issue a decision on the cross-motions for summary
13 judgement on or before February 1, 2020; and

14 WHEREAS the parties' consent to this Stipulation is conditioned on receiving a final
15 decision in this matter on or before February 1, 2020. In the event the Court has concerns with
16 this proposed schedule or the parties' request for a decision before February 1, 2020, in order to
17 avoid preliminary injunction proceedings, the parties are available for a telephone status
18 conference at the Court's convenience to discuss scheduling in this case:

19 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by the parties, through their undersigned counsel, that
20 this Court should enter an order providing that:

21 1. Defendants are prohibited from obligating, using, or otherwise placing beyond
22 the limits of judicial process any portion of the \$88.96 million authorized to be appropriated by
23 Congress for the Bangor Pier and Maintenance Facility prior to February 1, 2020. This
24 prohibition is enforceable through a court order;

2. The following briefing and hearing schedule shall govern resolution of this case:

DATE	EVENT
October 11, 2019	Defendants file administrative record regarding DoD's decision to authorize barrier projects pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 2808
October 25, 2019	Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (30 pages)
November 15, 2019	Defendants' Cross-Motion For Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (30 pages)
December 6, 2019	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Cross-Motion and Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (20 pages)
December 16, 2019	Defendants' Reply in Support of Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (20 pages)
Week of December 16, 2019 or January 6, 2020	Oral argument

3. This briefing schedule assumes there are no disputes about the completeness of the Administrative Record that Defendants produce on October 11, 2019. If Washington believes the Administrative Record is deficient or incomplete, it will promptly meet and confer with Defendants to determine whether any adjustments to the summary judgment briefing schedule will be necessary.

4. In light of the foregoing schedule, all other case management and pre-trial activity is stayed. The stay includes the deadlines for the parties to conduct a 26(f) conference, to file a Rule 26(f) report and case management statement, to provide initial disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1), and for Defendants to respond to the Complaint under Rule 12. This stay shall not preclude Plaintiff from (1) moving to compel supplementation of the administrative record or (2) amending its Complaint, if appropriate.

1 It is SO AGREED this 11th day of October 2019.

2 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
3 Attorney General

4 /s/ Andrew R.W. Hughes
5 MARTHA RODRIGUEZ LOPEZ, WSBA
#35466
6 ANDREW R.W. HUGHES, WSBA #49515
BRENDAN SELBY, WSBA #55325
7 Assistant Attorneys General
800 Fifth Ave., Ste. 2000
8 Seattle, WA 98104

9 TERA HEINTZ, WSBA #54921
10 Deputy Solicitor General
PO Box 40100
11 Olympia, WA 98504-0100

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

JOSEPH H. HUNT
Assistant Attorney General

JAMES M. BURNHAM
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

ALEX HAAS
Director, Federal Programs Branch

ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
Deputy Director,
Federal Programs Branch

13 /s/ Andrew I. Warden
14 ANDREW I. WARDEN (IN Bar
23840-49)
15 Senior Trial Counsel,
16 Federal Programs Branch

17 MICHAEL J. GERARDI
18 KATHRYN C. DAVIS
LESLIE COOPER VIGEN
RACHAEL L. WESTMORELAND
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs
Branch
1100 L St., NW, Rm. 12212
Tel: (202) 616-5084
Fax: (202) 616-8460
E-mail: Andrew.Warden@usdoj.gov

19 *Attorneys for Defendants*

ORDER

Having reviewed the foregoing stipulation and good cause appearing therefore, IT IS
HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Defendants are prohibited from obligating, using, or otherwise placing beyond the limits of judicial process any portion of the \$88.96 million authorized to be appropriated for the Bangor Pier and Maintenance Facility prior to February 1, 2020. This order shall be enforceable to the same extent as an injunction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65;

2. The following briefing and hearing schedule shall govern resolution of this case:

DATE	EVENT
October 11, 2019	Defendants file administrative record regarding Department of Defense's decision to authorize barrier projects pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 2808
October 25, 2019	Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (30 pages)
November 15, 2019	Defendants' Cross-Motion For Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (30 pages)
December 6, 2019	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Cross-Motion and Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (20 pages)
December 16, 2019	Defendants' Reply in Support of Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (20 pages)

3. This briefing schedule assumes there are no disputes about the completeness of the Administrative Record that Defendants produce on October 11. If Washington believes the Administrative Record is deficient or incomplete, it will promptly meet and confer with Defendants to determine whether any adjustments to the summary judgment briefing schedule will be necessary.

4. In light of the foregoing schedule, all other case management and pre-trial activity is stayed. The stay includes the deadlines for the parties to conduct a Rule 26(f) conference, to file a Rule 26(f) report and case management statement, to provide initial disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1), and for Defendants to respond to the Complaint under Rule 12. This stay shall not preclude Plaintiff from (1) moving to compel supplementation of the administrative record or (2) amending its Complaint, if appropriate.

5. To facilitate expedited and efficient final resolution of this case without the need for preliminary injunction proceedings, the Court will endeavor to issue a decision on the cross-motions for summary judgment on or before February 1, 2020.

6. In the event it is impracticable for the Court to issue a decision by February 1, 2020 and this Order needs to be extended the parties shall be available for a status conference at Seattle on January 21, 2020.

7. In the event the Court notifies the parties that the Court is unable to issue a decision before February 1, 2020, or in the event the Court has not issued a decision by January 21, 2020, Plaintiff may move for an extension of the order to prohibit the obligation of the funds at issue until the Court issues a decision on theross-motions for summary judgment. In the event Plaintiff requests such an extension, Defendants may oppose Plaintiffs' motion on any and all grounds, other than on the basis that the extension should not be granted because the expected obligation date is not imminent.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 16th day of October, 2019

Barbara Jacobs Rothstein
Barbara Jacobs Rothstein
U.S. District Court Judge